

CRAIG P. SEEBALD (*pro hac vice*)  
cseebald@mwe.com  
PAMELA J. MARPLE (*pro hac vice*)  
pmarple@mwe.com  
VINCENT C. VAN PANHUYS (*pro hac vice*)  
vvanpanhuys@mwe.com  
**McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP**  
600 Thirteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3096  
Telephone: 202.756.8000  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087

DANIEL E. ALBERTI (68620)  
dalberti@mwe.com  
**McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP**  
3150 Porter Drive  
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1212  
Telephone: 650.813.5000  
Facsimile: 650.813.5100

Attorneys for Defendants  
RENESAS TECHNOLOGY CORP.,  
RENESAS TECHNOLOGY AMERICA, INC.,  
HITACHI, LTD. AND HITACHI AMERICA, LTD.

[ADDITIONAL DEFENDANTS AND COUNSEL  
LISTED ON FINAL PAGE]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

IN RE STATIC RANDOM ACCESS  
MEMORY (SRAM) ANTITRUST  
LITIGATION

Case No. M:07-CV-01819-CW

MDL No. 1819

This Document Relates to:

ALL DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS

**JOINT STIPULATION AND ORDER  
GRANTING DEFENDANTS'  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO  
SUBMIT SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF  
EXPLAINING RELEVANCE OF THE GPU  
ORDER TO DEFENDANTS'  
OPPOSITION TO DIRECT PURCHASER  
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS  
CERTIFICATION AND TO ALLOW  
PLAINTIFFS TWO PAGE TO RESPOND**

1 WHEREAS, Civil Local Rule 7-11 permits a party to file an administrative motion with  
2 respect to miscellaneous administrative matters, not otherwise governed by federal statute,  
3 Federal or local rule or standing order of the assigned judge.

4 WHEREAS, Defendants seek to submit a brief of no more than two pages explaining the  
5 relevance of Honorable William H. Alsup's Order Certifying Limited Direct-Purchaser Class and  
6 Denying Indirect Purchaser in *In Re Graphics Processing Units Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No.  
7 1826 (N.D. Cal. July 18, 2008) ("*GPU* Order"), to Defendants' Opposition to Direct Purchaser  
8 Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification ("Opposition").

9 WHEREAS, Plaintiff requests two additional pages to respond to Defendants  
10 supplemental memorandum.

11 WHEREAS, the *GPU* Order was filed four days after Defendants filed their Opposition.  
12 Consequently, Defendants did not have an opportunity to explain the relevance of the *GPU*  
13 Order.

14 NOW THEREFORE, DEFENDANTS AND PLAINTIFFS, THROUGH THEIR  
15 RESPECTIVE COUNSEL, HEREBY STIPULATE to the Court entering the attached Proposed  
16 Order.

17 July 31, 2008

Respectfully Submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

20 By: /s/ Daniel E. Alberti  
21 Daniel E. Alberti

22 Attorneys for Defendants  
23 RENESAS TECHNOLOGY CORP.,  
24 RENESAS TECHNOLOGY AMERICA, INC.,  
25 HITACHI, LTD. AND HITACHI AMERICA,  
26 LTD.  
27  
28

July 31, 2008

COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY

By: /s/Steven N. Williams  
Steven N. Williams

Class Counsel for  
DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
PALO ALTO

**ORDER**

Upon stipulation of the parties, and good cause appearing the Court hereby ORDERS:

1. Defendants' may submit a supplemental brief of no more than two pages explaining the relevance of Honorable William H. Alsup's Order Certifying Limited Direct-Purchaser Class and Denying Indirect Purchaser in *In Re Graphics Processing Units Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1826, Case No. C. 06-07417 WHA (N.D. Cal. July 18, 2008).

2. Plaintiff may submit two pages in response to Defendants' supplementatl brief – in either its Reply in Support of Class Certification, or in a separate supplemental brief.

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

8/4/08



Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
The Honorable Claudia Wilken  
United States District Court Judge

WDC99 1598632-3.017575.0722